



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

here seen in the introduction of two leading and distinct choruses, as was done in "Octavia," then supposed to have been written by Seneca. The "Achilles" was not intended for the stage, or at least was never performed.

Some forty years after the writing of the "Achilles," in 1428 or 1429, Gregorio Corraro (1411-1464) produced his "Progne," the subject of which was taken from Ovid's "Metamorphoses," and the form from Seneca. Traces of the influence of Loschi's work are also to be found in it. The story of Philomela had already appealed to Mussato through the many tragic elements it contains. Corraro expanded the narrative of Ovid to one thousand and sixty-three lines, including choruses, and imitates quite closely in many passages Seneca's "Thyestes" and "Medea." He also paraphrases frequently the text of his original. As regards the unities, Corraro observes that of action, by beginning the play with the recital of the sins of Tereus, which naturally leads later to a stage effect. In this respect he shows a dramatic instinct superior to that of Mussato or Loschi, and goes on to prove this gift throughout the tragedy by the more artistic arrangement of his matter. He also omits the concluding chorus which his predecessors had erroneously used. But while the "Progne" is in general more technically correct, it does not observe the unities of place and time, and in style is inferior to the "Ecerinis" or the "Achilles." Yet Corraro profited by the oblivion into which these plays had fallen, and for some time after his death was regarded as the first author of modern tragedy. There is no evidence, however, that the "Progne" was ever performed.

With the "Progne," the Renaissance drama reaches the period of sudden development. Towards the middle of the fifteenth century, the classical tragedy passes from the scholar's study to the public stage. There it underwent many modifications, both from the necessity of adapting itself to acting and from the rivalry which it encountered in the popular theatre, at that time beginning to expand. The history of these changes will evidently be the theme of the next volume in this series. It would be unjust to its industrious author to pass over in silence the large number of notes which con-

tain the supporting material for the statements of the text, and which bear witness to the great amount of labor he has undergone. From these notes, and from the various appendices to the biography of the writers mentioned and other points of interest, this period of literary history can be safely assumed as having been placed on definite and sure foundations.

F. M. WARREN.

Adelbert College.

The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People.

Edited with a Translation and Introduction by THOMAS MILLER, M.A., Ph.D. Part 1, London: Early English Text Society, 1890-1.

THE Old English Bede was one of the first books selected by scholars for the printing-press. Twice before has it been printed in full: first, in 1643, by Abraham Wheelock, Professor of Arabic and first Professor of Anglo-Saxon at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; and again by John Smith, in 1722. Wheelock took the Cambridge University MS. as the basis of his edition, and seems to have followed it *verbatim et literatim*, only occasionally giving marginal readings from two other MSS., one at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and the other in the British Museum. These three MSS. are generally known and referred to as Ca., C., and B. respectively. Wheelock gives in parallel columns, the Old English text and Bede's Latin—not his own, as we might infer from Wülker ('Grundriss,' p. 404), though he does give three forms of Bede's preface: (1) Old English, (2) Bede's Latin, (3) a literal translation of the Old English back into Latin, the last being Wheelock's own work. His edition is full of misprints, and, perhaps, of more serious defects.

John Smith's edition (Cambridge, 1722) was in all respects a great improvement on that of Wheelock. Here, again, we have both Latin and Old English texts, though in different parts of the book. Smith, also, used MS. Ca. as the basis of his text, and compared it diligently with Wheelock's text, with the two other MSS. (B. and C.) that his predecessor had used, and with two others that seem to have been unknown to Wheelock. Of the last

two MSS., one was at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and the other belonged to Thomas Tanner, who had lent it to Smith's father: they are known as MSS. O. and T. respectively. Smith used MS. T. quite largely. He placed at the foot of the page all variants from all the MSS.,

"rejectis [*scil.* lectionibus] quidem fere infinitis quæ literis tantum, vocalibus præcipue, sunt diversæ."

It may be added that the honor of this work belongs largely to George Smith (John's father), who, we are told in the epistle to the reader, in his eagerness to get the work through the press, labored more arduously than his age and strength could endure, thus bringing on a fatal illness. The undertaking then passed into the hands of John, at that time a youth of twenty-two years.

The lack of a more modern edition has been seriously felt, for both March and Sweet, in their 'Readers,' call attention to the need. Sweet's own name had been suggested in connection with the task of preparing a suitable edition, but he seemed unwilling to turn his attention to it; and eleven years ago Körner ('Einleitung,' Theil ii, s. 194) wrote:

"Eine kritische Ausgabe von Bedas hist. eccl. Angl. wird schon seit Jahren von Prof. Schipper in Wien erwartet."

Dr. Miller's book, so far as issued, is a monument of erudition, patience, and prolonged labor. We have, thus far, the Introduction (pp. xiii-lix), and Old English text with modern English translation on opposite pages (pp. 2-486):

"The second part will contain full apparatus criticus and glossary, with a conspectus of the dialectical peculiarities of all MSS."

The Introduction contains a great mass of information and statistics for which scholars will sincerely thank the editor. It begins with an exact and detailed description of the four more complete MSS. (T. B. O. Ca.) and of the fragmentary C. These descriptions are much fuller than those usually given, and are as interesting as they are valuable. Dr. Miller believes that all the existing MSS. are of a common origin. This belief is founded on four facts:

1. The division into chapters is substantially the same in all MSS.

2. All MSS. place the "*Interrogationes*" [Bk. i. ch. 27] at the end of Bk. iii.

3. All place the appeal to the reader at the conclusion of the work, and not at the end of the *Præfatio*.

4. There are common peculiarities or corruptions found in all MSS.

He might have added that the same errors occur in all, for example, p. 26, l. 18, where *anes wana prittigum* translates *viginti et octo*; and compare translation of *anno quingentesimo octogesimo secundo*, p. 54, l. 21-2. Additional instances of mis-translation are p. 6, l. 6; 6, 8; 6, 21-2; 6, 25-6; 42, 17-18. Furthermore, the additions and omissions are the same in all MSS.

Dr. Miller thinks that the Old English translation was made from the Latin text as it appears in MS. Cott. Tib. c. ii. Of twenty-eight variants all but one favor this MS., while the other favors the Moore MS. This is an interesting question, and its solution deserves a fuller collection and comparison of variants.

Dr. Miller makes the first systematic attack on the belief in Alfred's authorship of the Old-English Bede. Sweet's incidental objection to this belief has already been answered by Körner (*Englische Studien*, i, 500; also 'Einleitung,' Theil ii, 196), and by Dr. August Schmidt ("Untersuchungen über König Ælfreds Bede-übersetzung," 7-8). Compare also an article by J. Ernst Wulfin in *Englische Studien* xv, 159-60, and one by this reviewer in MOD. LANG. NOTES, January 1891. Dr. Miller has examined the question in the most thorough and scholarly manner, and, reasoning almost entirely from internal evidence, is led to the conclusion that the translation is of Anglian origin. He even points out conjecturally the place—the monastery of Lichfield—where the translation may have been made.

In determining an Anglian origin for the translation, Dr. Miller is influenced by several matters:

1. The history and usage of certain words; as, *on* (= *ond*); *ono* (*onu*, *ona*, *heono*); *ac* interrogative; *in*, *on*; *mid*.

2. Peculiar inflectional forms.

3. Preference for *o* rather than *a* before nasals.

4. Preference for *ā* rather than *ea* before *l*+consonant.

With a formidable array of statistics, Dr. Miller reasons that the presence in the text of

a considerable number of Anglian forms and syntactical usages incontestably indicates an Anglian archetype, and that King Alfred, therefore, could not have made the translation. The respective ages and dialectal peculiarities of the various MSS. strongly support the theory advanced. Dr. Miller places the date of T. somewhat before the end of the tenth century, C. in the latter part of the same century, to O. he gives no date, Ca. a little later than the Conquest. They exhibit dialectal peculiarities in the same order, T. having more Anglian forms than any other, then C., then O., then Ca. The three small fragments found by Zupitza in MS. Cott. Dom. A. ix are believed to be older than any of the existing MSS., and it is noticeable that they contain a number of Anglian forms not found in the others. MS. B. is little used in Miller's investigations, because its

"scribe or editor has dealt very freely with his author, changing forms and words and recasting sentences."

Dr. Miller is in possession of important facts, and it would be difficult successfully to contest the conclusion to which they lead us: yet it may be that a too intent examination of these facts has distorted our conception of the real state of the case; at all events, some other factors should enter into a full consideration of the question at issue:—

1. Alfred's desire to place suitable reading matter in the hands of his people seems to be unquestioned. Apart from all historical evidence to that effect, we may assume, for the present, that he himself acted, at times, as a translator. What, now, of all accessible books would he be most likely to translate? It is none too easy to answer this question definitely, yet it certainly seems rational to suppose that piety, on the one hand, and patriotism, on the other, should lead to the production of versions of the 'Cura Pastoralis' and the 'Historia Ecclesiastica' among the very first fruits of his labor. Would it not have been passing strange if Alfred had translated anything at all, and had neglected the history of his own country?

2. Alfred himself tells us that his translations were not for any particular class, but for "all men":

For ðy me ðyncð betre ðæt we eac suma bec ða ðe nied-beðearfosta sien eallum monnum

to wiotonne, ðæt we ða on ðæt geðiode wend- en ðe we ealle gecnawan mægen . . . (Preface to 'Cura').

The Old English version of the 'Historia Ecclesiastica' is eminently a work that carries out these ideas, for it is far better adapted to popular reading by the omission of lengthy epistles, and of such other matter as would probably be of little interest to the average Englishman of the ninth century.

3. Dr. Miller has hardly done full justice to the historical testimony pointing to Alfred as the translator. The words of Ælfric and of William of Malmesbury are positive, and there is absolutely no historical evidence against Alfred's claim. Ælfric wrote probably less than a century after Alfred's death, and Malmesbury certainly not later than 1140: the nearness of these witnesses to Alfred's own time gives especial weight to their statements. Then there is the couplet written twice in MS. Ca.:

*Historicus quondam fecit me Beda latinum,
Ælfred rex Saxo transtulit ille pius.*

Finally, there is the West Saxon genealogy, in at least two MSS., which terminates abruptly with Alfred.

It is probably an error, however, to ascribe the whole work of this translation to any one man. We know that there were several scholars of some ability in England in Alfred's time, and nothing is more likely than that some of them should have aided the royal translator in his labors. Malmesbury, as quoted by Dr. Miller, gives us a broad hint of this:

"Præterea, quia nullus in suo regno literarum erat peritus, evocavit ex Mercia Wicciorum episcopum, qui jussu regis Dialogorum libros in Anglicum sermonem convertit."

Moreover, Alfred himself gives us an idea of his dependence upon others:

Ða ic ða gemunde hu sio lar lædengēpiodes ær ðissum afeallen wæs giond Angelcynn, ond ðeah monige cūðon englisc gewrit arædan, ða ongan ic ongemang oðrum mislicum ond manigfealdum bisgum ðisses kynerices ða boc wendan ond on englisc ðe is genemned on læden Pastoralis ond on englisc Hierdebooc, hwilum word be worde, hwilum andgiet of andgiete, swæ swæ ic hie geliornode æt Plegmunde minum ærcebiscepe ond æt Assere minum biscepe ond æt Grimbolde minum mæssepreoste ond æt Johanne minum mæssepreoste (Preface to 'Cura': Körner, Theil ii, s. 36).

Dr. Miller has pointed out that each MS. is the work of several copyists, who wrote in turn. There is abundant internal evidence, too, that the translation itself is the work of more than one hand; for in many places it is quite free and idiomatic, and in other passages it is so oppressively literal as hardly to be English at all. None but the veriest tyro in Latin could have blundered so hopelessly in rendering the heading of Chap. 9 of Book i.; and with the translation of *viginti et octo*, already given, we may compare (p. 252, l. 9) *per novendecim annos=anes wonðe twentig wintra* [MS. B. has *an læs þe twentig*]; (238, 2) *undesexaginta=anes wonþe syxtig*; (386, 25) *decem et novem annis=anes wonþe twentig wintra*. Possibly herein lies the reason why the name of no one man is mentioned in the text as the translator.

While Dr. Miller comes to us as a man with a theory—for which, indeed, he contends manfully—to his lasting credit be it repeated that he has examined this question of authorship in a spirit of the utmost fairness and candor, and, though his own convictions seem firmly rooted, he does not offensively obtrude them upon his readers. It would be interesting to have more from him upon the same subject. Dr. Schipper, too, unless he has given up his study of the Old English Bede, doubtless has much to say that scholars would be glad to read.

Much time and great labor have been expended in determining the Old-English text.

"T. was selected as the basis, and its defects supplemented from B. as belonging to the same recension. The text was completed and written out twice. . . . But after repeated collations and careful study of the MSS., it became evident that Bede was an Anglian and not a West-Saxon work, and that the first necessity was to exhibit a text representing as far as possible the Anglian archetype. This led me to discard B., and adopt a 'contamination' of texts founded on T. C. O. Ca. in order of preference."

Dr. Miller rejects MS. B., for reasons already given, and also Zupitza's leaves from MS. Cott. Dom. A. ix., though he gives numerous variants from B. and one (104, 12) from Z.

"T. has been collated twice throughout. O. has been collated throughout, and twice in those portions used to supplement T. B. has been collated throughout, and twice at the

beginning and end where T. is defective. Smith and Wheelock were collated and the resulting text collated throughout with the MS. Ca. The fragments of C. have been in part collated twice."

Surely no one will complain of lack of industry on the part of the editor; and, however much we might desire a text all from one MS., and, therefore, representing one age and one locality, few will be found who can read Dr. Miller's book and not applaud his judgment in piecing out his text from MSS. representing as nearly as possible the form in which it was first written. The book would have been better adapted to students' use if he had given marginal notes indicating the point where the text passes from one MS. to another, instead of trusting us to foot-notes and the table on p. xxii.

Of the translation little need be said except that it is generally good English, and, therefore, while the more interesting to the general reader into whose hands it may fall, it is so free as to be a little disappointing to the specialist who would have Dr. Miller's views on certain points of syntax. Such an investigator would probably prefer a rendering more like that of Thomson, Miller's only predecessor as a translator, in the 'Whole Works of King Alfred the Great.' In some places, too, Dr. Miller seems to have leaned rather heavily on the Latin text. Thus, on pp. 8-9, "*Ðætte se ylca biscop for ðam intingan untrumnyse feria gehæfd*," appears as "That the same bishop was detained there from illness," where there is apparent the influence of the corresponding Latin, "*Ut idem causa infirmitatis ibidem detentus*."

There are a few misprints. *Abysgad* appears as *absgyad* (48, 11); *semninga* as *semniga* (178, 25), and probably *Brotene* (12, 5) is for *Breotene*.

J. W. PEARCE.

Tulane University of Louisiana.

Selections from Heine's Poems. Edited, with Notes, by HORATIO STEVENS WHITE, Professor of the German Language and Literature in Cornell University. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., Publishers. 1890. 12mo, v, 220 pp.

PROFESSOR WHITE'S recent contribution to